

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action transmitted March 10, 2008 (the "Office Action"). The Office Action rejects Claims 1-5, 7-13 and 15-19. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-5, 7, 9-13, 15, and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Office Publication No. 1096713 to Yoshizawa et al. ("*Yoshizawa*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0044315 to Sugawara et al. ("*Sugawara*"). The Examiner rejects Claims 8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Yoshizawa* in view of *Sugawara*, as applied to Claims 1-5, 7, 9-13, 15 and 17-19 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0048066 to Antoniadis et al. ("*Antoniades*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1 recites demultiplexing the optical traffic into component signals of the optical traffic; splitting at least one of the component signals into a drop signal and a continue signal at a drop card; and selecting, at an add card separate from the drop card, between an add signal and the continue signal for communication on the network. Claims 9 and 17 recite similar elements. The cited references used in the rejections do not disclose these elements. For example, the portions of *Yoshizawa* relied on in the Office Action disclose functionality in a single optical add/drop multiplexer (OADM) as opposed to splitting signals into a drop signal and a continue signal at a drop card and selecting between an add signal and a continue signal for communication on the network at an add card that is separate from the drop card. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 9, and 17 are patentable over the cited art used in the rejections and request that the rejections of these claims, and all claims depending therefrom, be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Chad C. Walters, Attorney for Applicant, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6511.

No fee is believed to be due. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant



Chad C. Walters
Reg. No. 48,022
(214) 953-6511

Date: August 6, 2008

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

Customer Number: **05073**